

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/477,034	12/31/1999	LANCE W. DOVER	042390.P6115	8629	
7590 12/04/2003			EXAMINER		
MATTHEW C FAGAN			SURYAWANSHI, SURESH		
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD ART UNIT PA				PAPER NUMBER	
SEVENTH FL			2185		
LOS ANGELE	S, CA 900251026		DATE MAILED: 12/04/2003	DATE MAILED: 12/04/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<i>-</i> '	Application No.	Applicant(s)	5
Advisory Action	09/477,034	DOVER ET AL.	<u> </u>
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Suresh K Suryawanshi	2185	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 17 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application to the same of th	cation. A proper re- ch places the appli	oly to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	below);		
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NO	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme			
10. Other:		Dennis M. B Dennis M. B Primary Exa	utler

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 09/477,034

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that the claimed monotonic counter is different than an electronic odometer acting as a monotonic counter because the claimed monotonic counter is used for synchronizing software threads and the claimed monotonic counters are used in computer systems. But none of the claims presented for consideration has such limitations as argued by the applicants.